

Proposal Title	Rezoning of 18 James St, South	Windsor from SP2 to R3	
Proposal Summary :	The proposal seeks to rezone 18 James St, South Windsor from SP2 Infrastructure to R3 Medium Density Residential. An amendment to the applicable Lot Size Map to specify 450sqm minimum lot size map and an amendment to the applicable Height of Buildings map to specify 10m maximum height of buildings are also proposed. The intent is to enable residential development on the site with a maximum of two dwellings under dual occupancy.		
PP Number :	PP_2016_HAWKE_002_00	Dop File No :	16/01412
Proposal Details	4		
Date Planning Proposal Received :	07-Jan-2016	LGA covered :	Hawkesbury
Region :	Metro(Parra)	RPA :	Hawkesbury City Councli
State Electorate :	HAWKESBURY	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning		
Location Details			
Street : 18 Ja	ames St		
Suburb : Sout	Ih Windsor City :	NSW	Postcode : 2756
Land Parcel : Lot 4	4 DP 503048		
DoP Planning Office	er Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Georgina Ballantine		
Contact Number :	0298601568		
Contact Email :	georgina.ballantine@planning.nsw	.gov.au	
RPA Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Karu Wijayasinghe		
Contact Number :	0245604546		
Contact Email :	Karu.Wijayasinghe@hawkesbury.r	nsw.gov.au	
DoP Project Manager Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Derryn John		
Contact Number :	0298601505		
Contact Email :	derryn.john@planning.nsw.gov.au		
Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro North West subregion	Consistent with Strategy	No

Page 1 of 9

MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha)	0.00	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	N/A
No. of Lots	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	2
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment :		11	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Notes :	connen hioaidad ma mion		
	Management Taskforce. Inf Services, the NSW Office of Infrastructure NSW incorport	imment from the Hawkesbury-Nep irastructure NSW consulted with f Environment and Heritage, and prated advice from the agencies pommended refusal of the plannin	the NSW State Emergency I Roads and Maritime Services. into a letter (Tab C), received
External Supporting Notes :	Management Taskforce. Inf Services, the NSW Office o Infrastructure NSW incorpo on 24 May 2016, which reco	ment from the Hawkesbury-Nep rastructure NSW consulted with f Environment and Heritage, and prated advice from the agencies	ean Valley Flood Risk the NSW State Emergency I Roads and Maritime Services. into a letter (Tab C), received
	Management Taskforce. Inf Services, the NSW Office of Infrastructure NSW incorpt on 24 May 2016, which reco t jectives - s55(2)(a) jectives provided? Yes The proposal seeks to re Medium Density Resider	ment from the Hawkesbury-Nep frastructure NSW consulted with f Environment and Heritage, and orated advice from the agencies ommended refusal of the plannin mended refusal of the plannin some 18 James St, South Winds ntial to facilitate residential deve som and a maximum height of b	ean Valley Flood Risk the NSW State Emergency I Roads and Maritime Services. into a letter (Tab C), received
Notes : equacy Assessmen Statement of the objust a statement of the objust a statement of the objust and the ob	Management Taskforce. Inf Services, the NSW Office o Infrastructure NSW incorpt on 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016,	ament from the Hawkesbury-Nep irastructure NSW consulted with f Environment and Heritage, and orated advice from the agencies ommended refusal of the plannin example of the plannin of the plannin sommended refusal of the plannin of the plannin sommended refusal of the plannin of the plannin of the plannin source of the plannin source of the plannin source of the plannin source of the plannin of the planni of the plannin of the plannin of the plannin of the plannin of	ean Valley Flood Risk the NSW State Emergency I Roads and Maritime Services. into a letter (Tab C), received ng proposal. sor from SP2 Infrastructure to R3 slopment. Council is proposing a ulidings of 10m to be consistent entage on three sides. The land is north and blocks of R3 to the eas is further to the south and west.
Notes : equacy Assessmen Statement of the objust a statement of the objust a statement of the objust and the ob	Management Taskforce. Inf Services, the NSW Office of Infrastructure NSW incorpt on 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016, which reco b 24 May 2016, which reco a 24 May 2016,	Imment from the Hawkesbury-Nep irastructure NSW consulted with f Environment and Heritage, and orated advice from the agencies ommended refusal of the plannin example of the plannin of the planni of the plannin of th	ean Valley Flood Risk the NSW State Emergency I Roads and Maritime Services. into a letter (Tab C), received ag proposal. sor from SP2 Infrastructure to R3 slopment. Council is proposing a ulidings of 10m to be consistent ontage on three sides. The land is north and blocks of R3 to the eas

Page 2 of 9

# Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b)

Is an explanation of provi	sions provided? Yes					
Comment :	Council proposes to ac Hawkesbury Local Envi	hieve the rezoning through the following amendments to ironmental Plan 2012.				
	1. Amend the Land Zoning Map to change the current zoning of the site from SP2 Infrastructure to R3 Medium Density Residential.					
	2. Amend the Lot Size N	2. Amend the Lot Size Map to specify 450sqm minimum lot size.				
	3. Amend the Height of	Buildings Map to specify 10m maximum height of buildings.				
	Should the proposal pro amendments will appea	oceed with a proposed rezoning to R2 Low Density Residential, the Ir as below.				
	1. Amend the Land Zon Infrastructure to R2 Lov	ing Map to change the current zoning of the site from SP2 v Density Residential.				
	· · ·	leight of Building maps can remain as stated in the planning nding R3 and R2 land is designated for 450sqm minimum lot size lings.				
Justification - s55 (2)	(c)					
a) Has Council's strategy	been agreed to by the Dire	ector General? Yes				
b) S.117 directions identit	fied by RPA :	1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries				
* May need the Director General's agreement		3.1 Residential Zones 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes 4.1 Acid Sulfate Solls				
		5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney				
Is the Director Genera	l's agreement required? Ye	95				
c) Consistent with Standa	rd Instrument (LEPs) Orde	er 2006 : <b>Yes</b>				
d) Which SEPPs have the	₽ RPA identified?	SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SREP No 9—Extractive Industry (No 2—1995) SREP No. 20 - Hawkesbury–Nepean River (No. 2 - 1997)				
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	The site is located within an area under review by the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Flood Management Review Taskforce in relation to flood evacuation and risk to life. The Department's Sydney Region West team consulted with the Taskforce (through Infrastructure NSW) and received comments on 24 May. A copy of the letter from Infrastructure NSW is attached, incorporating advice from the Office of Environment and Heritage, Roads and Maritime Services and State Emergency Services. The key points of the letter are discussed in the Environmental, Social and Economic - Flooding section of this report.					
Have inconsistencies with	n items a), b) and d) being	adequately justified? Yes				
If No, explain :	SECTION 117 DIRECT	IONS				
~	<b>Consistency</b> with this	ing, petroleum production and extractive industries Direction must be established via consultation with the NSW ry - Resources and Energy. The determination will dictate the terms				
æ		grating land use and transport t strictly apply, as the proposal relates only to rural land. However,				

Page 3 of 9

as the intent of the proposal is to facilitate residential development, the objectives of the Direction have been addressed.

The proposal is considered to be consistent with this direction as it seeks to provide a small quantity of rural residential housing within 200m of the centre of South Windsor, with associated infrastructure and services.

#### DIRECTION 4.1 – Acid sulfate soils

This Direction does apply to the planning proposal as it will affect land having a probability of containing acid sulfate soils, as shown on the Acid Sulfate Soils Planning Maps held by the Department of Planning. The land is identified as Class 5 on Council's Acid Sulfate Soils map, being the least constrained class of acid sulfate soils.

The proposal is considered to be consistent with this direction as the intensification of residential land use is minor. The existing cl. 6.1 'Acid sulphate soils' in Hawkesbury LEP 2012 also provides adequate controls to address this matter.

#### **DIRECTION 4.3 - Flood Prone Land**

Part (6) of the planning proposal report (Urbis) notes that Section 117 Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land does not apply as the land is above the 1%AEP flood level. However, the consultation letter of 23 May 2016 received from Infrastructure NSW states that the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage advises that consistency with Direction 4.3 Is required for this proposal as it relates to 'flood prone land', being land located below the Probable Maximum Flood (as defined by the Direction in the NSW Floodplain Development Manual 2005). Consistency with the Direction requires the proposal to consider flood risk, both to property and risk to life. The Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Flood Risk Management Taskforce has identified South Windsor as a problematic hotspot area with Inadequate evacuation capacity for regional evacuation from floods.

Dual occupancy, multi dwelling housing and residential flat buildings are permitted uses in the R3 Medium Density Residential zone. The proposal's inconsistency with Direction 4.3 is considered to be of minor significance, subject to the proposal proceeding with a proposed rezoning to R2 Low Density Residential (as opposed to Council's proposed R3 Medium Density Residential).

#### DIRECTION 4.4 – Planning for bushfire protection

This Direction does apply to the planning proposal as it will affect land identified as Category 1 vegetation on the Hawkesbury Bushfire Prone Land Map. A preliminary bushfire investigation has been carried out and concluded that the majority of the site would be more accurately classified as Category 2, being cleared grassland.

RECOMMENDATION: The Secretary can be satisfied that the requirements of the Direction will be met. Should the proposal be approved a condition will be included in the Gateway determination that consultation should be undertaken with the Rural Fire Service prior to exhibition, in accordance with the Direction.

#### **DIRECTION 7.1 - A Plan for Growing Sydney**

It is considered that the proposal is inconsistent with Action 4.2.2 of A Plan for Growing Sydney in relation to flood constraints. Further details are provided under the Strategic Planning Framework section of this report.

#### SEPP No. 55 - Remediation of Land

The land has been used for limited grazing in the past and therefore carries a low risk of soil and groundwater contamination. The applicant has said that there is no evidence that any activities have occurred on the land which would give rise to contamination. Clause 6 of SEPP 55 requires that Council carry out an Investigative study if contamination is suspected. Council has stated that any investigation could be carried out following the issue of the Gateway determination. Should the proposal be approved it is considered that, due to the minor risk of contamination, an investigative study is not required and there are adequate protections at the development application stage.

Page 4 of 9

	SREP No 9 – Extractive Industry (No 2 – 1995) The subject land is not in the vicinity of land described in Schedules 1, 2 or 5 of SREP 9, so it is unlikely that it contains extractive material of regional significance.
	Should a Gateway determination be issued, it is likely that it will require consultation with the NSW Department of Industry - Energy & Resources in order to establish that no extractive materials will be sterilised by the proposal's progression.
	SREP No. 20 – Hawkesbury-Nepean River (No 2 – 1997) The aim of SREP No. 20 is to protect the environment of the Hawkesbury – Nepean River system by ensuring that the impacts of future land uses are considered in a regional context. Part 2 of SREP 20 provides general planning considerations, specific planning policies and recommended strategies.
	It is considered that the proposal, given its small scale, can be achieved without any significant adverse impact on the Hawkesbury River Catchment.
Mapping Provided -	s55(2)(d)
Is mapping provided? Ye	95
Comment :	Council has provided current and proposed Land Zoning Maps, Lot Size Maps and Height of Building Maps (p. 30 of the planning proposal). Aerial photographs are provided with local features marked (p. 76 of the Ordinary Meeting notes). New maps will need to be provided if the proposal proceeds with a proposed rezoning to R2 Low Density Residential.
Community consulta	ition - s55(2)(e)
Has community consulta	tion been proposed? Yes
Comment :	Community consultation will be carried out in line with the conditions of the Gateway determination.
Additional Director G	General's requirements
Are there any additional	Director General's requirements? No
If Yes, reasons :	
Overall adequacy of	the proposal
Does the proposal meet	the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment :	
Proposal Assessment	
Principal LEP:	
Due Date : September 2	2012
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 2012 commenced on 21 September 2012.
_	
Assessment Criteria	
Need for planning proposal :	The proposal is not as a result of any strategic study or report. Council's justification of the proposal is that the scout hall has not been in use in recent years. The site therefore requires the removal of the SP2 Infrastructure zone to support development potential, with a view to providing up to 2 residential dwellings.

Page 5 of 9

Consistency with strategic planning framework :

#### A PLAN FOR GROWING SYDNEY

The proposal is generally consistent with the residential objectives of A Plan for Growing Sydney 2015, which applies in a broader, regional context. The proposal would serve as a minor expansion of an existing rural neighbourhood centre, and would provide land for residential development.

The proposal is inconsistent with Action 4.2.2 - Complete and Implement the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Floodplain Management Review. Action 4.2.2 states that 'evacuation and emergency management issues need to be addressed upfront in the planning process' and 'the Government will develop a single flood model for the entire Hawkesbury-Nepean floodplain to support land use planning, flood mitigation, emergency response, evacuation and recovery in the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley'. The Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Floodplain Management Review Taskforce is developing a Flood-Risk Management Strategy based on the recommendations of the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Flood Management Review In 2013. Until the Strategy is released, the Taskforce recommends that any increase in residential density on flood-prone land in the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley should not be permitted, due to the potential for Increased risk to life and property. Further discussion of flooding issues can be found in the 'Flooding' section of this report below.

#### DRAFT NORTH WEST SUBREGIONAL STRATEGY

The proposal is broadly consistent with the residential objectives of the draft North West Subregional Strategy. It will provide housing growth in an existing centre, and will assist Hawkesbury City Council in meeting its housing growth target under the Strategy.

The proposal is inconsistent with the Flood Constraints section of the Strategy (pgs 81-82). The Strategy states that 'for most parts of the Hawkesbury...to the south of the Hawkesbury River there is no capacity for additional growth outside that already planned under Hawkesbury Council's Local Environmental Plan, without substantial further upgrades to the flood evacuation network.' The required upgrades will be identified as a result of the findings of the Taskforce. As the site has not been identified as having capacity for additional growth in Hawkesbury LEP 2012, it is considered that the proposal is inconsistent, but that the inconsistency is of minor significance if the proposal is updated, using a proposed zoning of R2 Low Density Residential.

Environmental social economic impacts :

#### FLOODING

The Department's Sydney Region West team consulted with the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Flood Management Review Taskforce (through infrastructure NSW) with respect to flood risk and evacuation for the site. The consultation letter of 23 May 2016, received from Infrastructure NSW, is attached. The key points of the letter are as follows.

1. South Windsor is a 'flood island', an area above the possible flood extent that is cut off by flood waters and must therefore be evacuated.

2. The Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Flood Risk Management Taskforce identified South Windsor as a problematic hotspot area with inadequate evacuation capacity for regional evacuation from floods.

3. Given the evacuation capacity constraints, the NSW State Emergency Service strongly recommends that any densification of development in South Windsor should not be permitted.

4. Part (6) of the planning proposal report notes that Section 117 Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land does not apply as the land is above the 1%AEP flood level. However, the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage advises that consistency with the Direction is required for this proposal as it relates to 'flood prone land', being land located below the Probable Maximum Flood (as defined by the Direction in the NSW Floodplain Development Manual 20015). Consistency with the Direction requires the proposal to consider flood risk, both to property and risk to life.

Despite the recommendations for refusal arising from consultation with the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Floodplain Risk Management Taskforce (Tab C) it is recommended that the proposal is supported due to the minimal residential increase on the site, but the proposed rezoning is changed to R2 Low Density Residential to remove

Page 6 of 9

ezoning of 18 James	St, South Windsor	from SP2	to R3		
			uch as multi dwelling hous nl-detached dwellings.	ing, dual occu	pancy,
	The proposal is unlik	a medium o kely to affect	lensity residential area and any critical habitat or threa		
	detrimental environn	nental effect	S.		
	SEWERAGE The site is connected	d to the exis	ting sewerage network.		
	flooding results in th associated with the p	e potential to ne loss or pro proposal is r a minor pos	o cause significant negative operty and/or life, but it is c ninor, due to the small incre itive social and economic e ose to amenities.	onsidered that ease in resider	t any risk ntial density. The
Assessment Process	S		IK.		
Proposal type :	Routine		Community Consultation Period :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make	12 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Office of Environmen NSW Rural Fire Serv Transport for NSW - State Emergency Ser Other	ice Roads and I	-		
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)(b	o) : No				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional st	udies, if required.				
If Other, provide reasons					
No additional studies a					
Identify any internal cons	sultations, if required :				
No internal consultation	n required				
is the provision and fund	ling of state infrastructu	ire relevant ti	this nlan? No		
If Yes, reasons :					
ocuments					
Document File Name			DocumentType Na	ame	Is Public
A	Delegation - 18 James	Etreet	Proposal		No

Page 7 of 9

Planning Proposal - 18	James Street, South	Proposal	Yes
Windsor.pdf Manping for 48 James 6	Stroot Couth Mindoon and	Man	Yes
Mapping for 18 James Street, South Windsor.pdf Council Report and Adoption - 18 James Street, South		Map Proposal	Yes
Windsor.pdf			
Inning Team Recom	nendation		
Preparation of the planni	ng proposal supported at this stage:F	Recommended with Conditions	
S.117 directions:	1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production 3.1 Residential Zones	and Extractive Industries	
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Trans	sport	
	3.5 Development Near Licensed Ad	erodromes	
	4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 5.1 Implementation of Regional St	ratoriles	
	5.1 Implementation of Regional Stu 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for G	-	
Additional Information :	SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS		
	It is considered that the proposal's Prone Land and 7.1 A Plan for Gro significance, subject to the propos Residential.	wing Sydney can be approved	as being of minor
	Should the planning proposal proc inconsistencies with Directions 4.3 amended planning proposal.		
	DELEGATION OF PLAN MAKING F	UNCTIONS	
	Council has indicated that it intend making function for this planning delegate agree to delegation to Co	proposal. It is recommended th	
	RECOMMENDATION		
	It is recommended that the plannin conditions.	ng proposal proceed subject to	the following
	1. Amendment of the planning pro rather than R3 Medium Density Re		ow Density Residential
	2. To comply with the requirement consultation should occur prior to		the following
	(a) Deputy Secretary of the Depart 117 Direction 1.3 Mining, Petroleur (b) Commissioner of the NSW Rura Bushfire Protection.	n Production and Extractive Inc	lustries;
	3. Community consultation is requ	ired under sections 56(2)(c) an	d 57 of the Act as follows
	(a) the planning proposal must be (b) the relevant planning authority exhibition of planning proposals a publicly available along with plann to Preparing LEPs (Department of	must comply with the notice re nd the specifications for mater Ing proposals as identified in s	quirements for public ial that must be made section 5.5.2 of A Guide
	4. Consultation is required with the the Act and/or to comply with the		

Page 8 of 9

Rezoning of 18 James	St, South Windsor from SP2 to R3	
	• Office of Environment and Heritage • Roads and Maritime Services • State Emergency Services	
	Each public authority is to be provided with a copy of the planning proposal and any relevant supporting material, and given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal.	
-	5. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the Act. This does not discharge Council from any obligation it may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing (for example, in response to a submission or if reclassifying land).	
*	6. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 12 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.	
Supporting Reasons :	The proposal is supported as it will result in a very minor increase in residential densities being one additional primary dwelling. The site is surrounded by residential development and it is located centrally in the current urban area of Windsor (ie not located on the town fringe).	
Signature:	Q.	
Printed Name:	C VAN LAEREN Date: 16/08/16	